UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Abolishing the Institution of War

By S. O. LEVINSON

Some Thoughts on Religion

By ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

A Letter from London

By HARRISON BROWN

"Patriotic" Persecutors

By LUCIA AMES MEAD

VOLUME CI NUMBER 4

Chicago, March 26, 1928

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
HENRY LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthèeff
CANADA—Norman T. Dowd
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

Editors:

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**
Curtis W. Reese **Louis L. Mann**

UNITY is a weekly paper, sixteen pages, containing timely editorial comment, special articles, foreign correspondence by its own representatives in Europe and Asia, book reviews, and regular reports of news from the field of liberal thought and action.

UNITY was the first American paper to discover Gandhi, of India. When the great Mahatma was unknown even to newspapers, UNITY hailed him as "the greatest man in the world." Its files contain the most complete record of Gandhi and his work that exists in this country. His autobiography, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth" is now appearing in weekly installments.

UNITY was the first American paper to espouse and advocate the Outlawry of War, that remarkable peace program that is challenging the attention of the world.

UNITY has for more than forty years championed the idea of universal religion which finds in freedom the secret of unity and brotherhood, and it is today the outstanding organ of world religion.

Sample copies on request.

$3.00 per year.

700 Oakwood Boulevard **CHICAGO**

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 87
Some Thoughts on Religion — ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 89
Jottings—J. H. H. 90
ARTICLES—
Modern Capitalism—*R. H. Tawney* 87
Abolishing the Institution of War—S. O. LEVINSON 91
A Letter from London—HARRISON BROWN 93
"Patriotic" Persecutors—LUCIA AMES MEAD 94
Jenkin Lloyd Jones and the Orient—J. T. SUNDERLAND 95
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part IV. Chapters XXVI and XXVII—M. K. GANDHI 96
POETRY—
Supplication—FRANCIS NEILSON 90
The Undying—KENNETH W. PORTER 97
CORRESPONDENCE—
The Fiftieth Anniversary—A Tribute from Our Australian Correspondent — CHARLES STRONG 98
Congratulations—ELMER WARD COLE 98
An Echo of the Anniversary—MARK H. DIX 98
"Humanity"—C. G. ARNOLD 98
Unity's Naming and Sub-Title — FRED K. GILLETTE 98
Biographies of Jesus—F. H. FOOTE 98
A Japanese Criticism of "Mother India" 99
A Correction—MARY SHEEPSHANKS 99
THE FIELD—
Moral and Religious Leadership Today—LESTER LEAKE RILEY 99

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CI MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1928 NUMBER 4

MODERN CAPITALISM

It is that whole system of appetites and values, with its deification of the life of snatching to hoard, and hoarding to snatch, which now, in the hour of its triumph, while the plaudits of the crowd still ring in the ears of the gladiators and the laurels are still unfaded on their brows, seems sometimes to leave a taste as of ashes on the lips of a civilization which has brought to the conquest of its material environment resources unknown in earlier ages, but which has not yet learned to master itself. It was against that system, while still in its supple and insinuating youth, before success had caused it to throw aside the mask of innocence . . . that the saints and sages . . . launched their warnings and their denunciations. The language in which theologians and preachers expressed their horror of the sin of covetousness may appear to the modern reader too murkily sulphurous. . . . But rashness is a more agreeable failing than cowardice, and, when to speak is unpopular, it is less pardonable to be silent than to say too much.

R. H. Tawney,
in "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism."

UNITY was one of the few papers in this country that refused from the beginning to get excited about the big navy bill. We said as early as January 2nd last that the admirals might declare that we are to build a new billion dollar navy. "Only we aren't," was our assertion! And now we see that our assertion was as sound as it was prompt. Never for a moment was there a reflection of a shadow of a possibility of that navy bill going through. The people of this country are at heart pacifist. They may be hard to arouse from their absorption in automobiles and radios to a burning consciousness of moral issues. They may be deceived, misled, and in the excitement of war transformed into the likeness of raging militarists. But let them see a question clearly, honestly, calmly, and they will react to the side of sanity and peace every time. In this case, the big navy men did their best to muddy the waters, only in the end to tumble themselves into the very mess which they had so carefully arranged for others. Wilbur of course made the expected fool of himself. If there had only been some way of keeping the Secretary quiet, the Navy's cause might not have been so badly served. But the admirals thus led, and stupid themselves, only made a bad matter infinitely worse. It was this fact, quite as much as the unprecedented protest from the voters, that unnerved the Congressmen, and drove them one and all to cover. What is left of the navy bill is now of not the slightest consequence. The demonstration has been made that the American people have no intention of being led into a naval race with England, or any other power or combination of powers. Thus the admirals have done us a good turn. In their delightful and naive way, they have shown to all the world that America will have nothing of them and their silly schemes.

At last we learn just what Russia was doing when she urged universal disarmament upon the world. Thanks to Arthur Ransome, correspondent in Moscow of the Manchester *Guardian,* we get a statement of the Russian program as presented in the pages of the official *Izvestia.* The gist of the proposal, first set forth by Litvinoff at Geneva on November 30th last, was that the complete disarmament of all countries, including Soviet Russia, should be accomplished in four years, enough being done the first year to make war difficult if not impossible. The plan for disarmament in this first year provided for a 50 per cent demobilization on the land, the destruction of all stores of arms and ammunition, the abolition of all the most important naval armaments and air forces, and of all war institutions. Complete disarmament, as we have said, must be accomplished during the following three years. "This project," says the *Izvestia,* referring to details,

"is a complete system of measures directed to the realization of the idea of disarmament, a system the aim of which is the direct prevention of the possibility of war and consequently the assurance of peace." The difference between the Soviet convention and the convention previously worked out by the League of Nations Commission is that "the Soviet proposal is worked out with a view to peace and its preservation, while the League of Nations project is worked out with a view to war and actually with the object of perfecting the methods of military action. In fact, the League of Nations project is completely built on the supposition that war is inevitable." The reason of the contradiction between the name and the contents of the League of Nations Disarmament Convention is that the whole system of treaty obligations is aimed less at the prevention of war than at its direction. "The whole activity of the League of Nations is aimed at the prevention of an attack on the post-war status quo and with a view to being able at its discretion to move the military forces of European States against the so-called disturber of the peace." Geneva speaks of the minimum armament necessary in case of war. The Soviet project, on the other hand, is aimed "not at the minimum armament but at the maximum disarmament."

Commenting upon this statement thus summarized by Mr. Ransome, the Russian *Pravda* says, "If you really mean to shoot peoples, then throw away and

destroy your guns." To us, as to Arthur Ransome, there is no answer to this challenge. The European powers themselves confessed as much when they refused to discuss the Russian proposal, and contented themselves with charging the Bolsheviks with insincerity. "But if we are insincere, as the capitalist diplomats say," retorts the *Pravda,* "why do they not expose us by agreeing to our proposal?" Again, we find no answer! The fact is, as Bernard Shaw has pointed out with his usual perspicacity, Russia called the bluff of the great powers, and disarmament is now dead openly instead of secretly.

The modern demos likes his circus scarcely less than did that of ancient Rome. An old municipality in Massachusetts put itself on the front page of the newspapers at a recent election by thrusting the town "cut-up" into the mayor's office. Our largest cities are not unsusceptible. The principal difference between New York and Chicago seems to be that Chicago's mayor, unlike New York's mayor, does not know how much of a clown he is. The situation in New York is saved further by the presence in the office next highest to the mayoralty of a quiet, hard-working public servant, who seems really to enjoy making compensation or amends for the glaring administrative deficiencies of his superior. This man automatically comes into the office of chief executive during the capricious junketings of the mayor, and, having his hand in, probably saves many a situation from utter debacle while the mayor is acting his silly part of vaudeville entertainer to the general. Nobody accuses the mayor of New York of administrative ability. His irresponsible habits are costing the people uncalculated sums; but they seem to like it, on the whole, and if he were up for re-election now he would doubtless be re-installed in office on a landslide. People are queer. Primitive, frontier conditions often left politics to supply almost the only diversion in the year's program. It is still possible, even in older and well settled communities, to practice political vaudeville with great success. While all goes smoothly, and administrative inefficiency is only draining away the people's money in daily ineptitude and petty graft, the community does not realize how much it pays for its official wise-cracks and agile farces. But even giddy New York may yet be shocked into appreciating the perils of a realm where the jester wears the crown. There are industrial disasters impending. Not only are long bread lines forming, but an unscrupulous public utility corporation is taking advantage of weakness in high places to sand-bag its own employees and hold up the helpless public. And a dandified Mayor can only sputter in impotent vexation between his silly turns upon the stage.

Liberty, the weekly magazine, had this to say some time ago about pacifists:

> The pacifist is another manifestation of inferiority. The weakling, inclined to cowardice, the physically unfit and underdeveloped, seeing strong, virile men in uniform marching with martial tread under waving banners to the cheers of fair women, resents his own inferiority and, knowing that he never can hope to equal the soldier, becomes a violent pacifist.

This is the kind of thing that we used to get during the War when men were hysterical, and expressed their hysteria in foolish words. But it is something of a surprise to read a statement of this sort today, even in a silly sheet like *Liberty,* when men are supposed to have discovered and thus recovered from their war-mania. The idea of the pacifist as a coward is, of course, just about the most topsy-turvy notion that ever found its way into an ignorant and prejudiced mind. Call the roll of pacifists, and let's see how many cowards and weaklings there are among them. Jesus of Nazareth?—his broken body on the cross of Calvary, with the soldiers dicing for his garments at its foot, is all the answer that we need. George Fox?—his defiance of the armed captains of Cromwell to their faces, remains one of the epic deeds of heroism in modern history; indeed, the Friends have a record of valor unmatched by any other people of whom we know. William Lloyd Garrison?—was he a coward when he faced the Boston mobs on behalf of freedom for the slave? Mahatma Gandhi?—like Paul, "beaten with rods, stoned, . . . in labor and travail, in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness . . . in imprisonments, in tumults, . . . long suffering!" "Inclined to cowardice" indeed! Read, if you will, the epic annals of the race, and we will challenge you to find any feat of arms to compare with those performed as the routine tasks of every-day by the non-resistant pacifists. There are cowards among pacifists, of course, just as there are cowards among soldiers. Says the great war correspondent, Frederick Palmer—

> "Three men out of five are brave if it is the thing to be brave. They will follow the one when he leads. The fifth is naturally timid. He is not always strong physically; frequently he is undernourished. As a man he is disinclined to take risks . . . unless it happens that he has the courage of conviction that war is wrong, and fears no risks and no hardship as long as it does not involve killing his fellowmen. In that case he may be physically well and strong, an athlete. Ordinarily the fifth man goes into action as an unresisting unit of the machine in which he was drilled. . . . The fear of confessed poltroonery in the presence of his fellows overwhelms his fear of the enemy."

Yes, there is a proportion of cowardice everywhere. But there is no one in five among pacifists, as there seems to be among soldiers. It takes too much courage to "stand alone!"

The Modernist mind is essentially a muddy mind. There are just two possible conceptions that can logically be held about the Bible. The one is the traditional idea, as propounded by the Fundamentalists, that the Bible is the Word of God, dictated by the Divine Being as the revelation of all truth forever; the other is the idea, as presented by the Liberals, that the Bible is a collection of human documents, written by fallible men in expression of their personal convictions and in

interpretation of the opinions and practices of their place and time. Between these two points of view, there is no middle ground; yet it is precisely such ground that the Modernists pretend to find and occupy. The Bible is divine and holy, but is of course not to be taken literally; the Bible is human and imperfect, but is the rule of life and a guide to salvation! Where is there consistency or even honesty in such a position as that? Again, take the question of Jesus! The Fundamentalist contends that Jesus was God—a perfectly clear idea; the Liberal asserts that Jesus was a man—another perfectly clear idea. But what does the Modernist say? Why, that Jesus was human, O yes, but had uniquely divine elements in him that made him different from, far above, all other men who have ever lived—an idea about as clear as dish-water! Or again, take Christianity! The Fundamentalist proclaims flatly that Christianity is a revealed religion, necessary to salvation, and that those who do not accept it must perish eternally. The Liberal accepts Christianity as one of the historic religions of the past, valuable not for its origin at all but only for such of its moral and spiritual content as is permanently precious. Here is sharp differentiation. Yet the Modernist crawls, or tries to crawl, somewhere in between, and affirms that Christianity is an historic phenomenon and at the same time a special revelation. All this is "muddiness," when it is not downright equivocation and dishonesty. Our Modernists need nothing quite so much as a straight-out facing of the facts, and a clear-cut confession of what these facts mean.

UNITY, having just celebrated its own fiftieth anniversary, knows how to join in the celebration of the tenth anniversary of Oswald Garrison Villard's editorship of the *Nation*, the outstanding organ in this country of independent liberal opinion. The *Nation* is priceless, first of all, as a newspaper which prints not "all the news that's fit to print," but all the news that is worthy of the attention of an intelligent mind. Events reported in this great weekly journal are events which may or may not be exciting today, but are certain to be important not only today but indefinitely in the future. This is because the news selected involves issues not of passion but of principle—of ideals that concern the enduring welfare of mankind. Which means that when the historian of the future comes to write the history of these times, he will consult the *Nation* as the inspired record of all that was significant and basic! Secondly, the *Nation* is preeminent among contemporary journals for its free and fearless comment upon events. What a trained and honest mind, seeking nothing but the truth, and brave enough to confess openly and unreservedly what it finds, what such a mind should think about the happenings of our day is better stated in the *Nation* than in any other paper of which we have knowledge. We do not always agree with the *Nation,* but we hold it none the less to be a light in darkness, a trumpet-call above the clamor of contemporary confusion. Lastly, the *Nation* is invaluable as the chain of contact which binds together, as in one family, the liberal forces of America, and indeed of the world. We are a scattered group, we liberals—far-flung and lonely in the great spaces of this earth. To us each week comes this enlightened paper; and each issue is as a golden link that ties us to one chain of common purpose and high endeavor. What the *Nation* is today, Villard has made it. Like every institution, this paper is but the lengthened shadow of a great man. To this man, whom we honor and love, we offer our salutations, and to him and to his journal wish long life and abounding prosperity.

Some Thoughts on Religion

Religion has come to mean to the modern man the functioning of his life at its highest and best, i. e., in those ways which most separate him from the beast of the field.

Religion stands for a complex experience which involves the whole person. It can not be defined under one concept.

Life that is manifest in humanity is individual. The qualities which give significance to human life belong to individuals. But the highest life is found in association with others. Only in a social order do Justice, Righteousness, Peace, Mercy, and Love have meaning.

Religion then is not a way of escape. It is a way of life. It is that attitude toward life (toward self and others) which enables life to function freely. For the end of life is more and more life.

The man who with reverence for life seeks with open mind for richer and fuller experience is a religious man.

For one man to live his best others must live their best. This is the verdict of experience. Reverence for life involves the seeking for all the fullest opportunity for the realization of the possibilities of their lives.

Religion thus centers around reverence for life and is expressed in the search for that experience we call truth which enables all men to attain their highest and best.

From another point of view man sees that freedom is the basic condition of fellowship, and that in

fellowship men attain their best. Religion then is the seeking of freedom for life in order that it may be revealed at its best in all men.

The closed mind dams up life. It thwarts life itself. Man can use the past but he must not be enslaved by it. Man's chief concern is with the future. He must use the past for guidance, but it is the future that gives meaning to life. Life is then an adventure. Religion is a name for man's determination to enter upon this adventure. The religious man stays in no closed harbor but sails the open uncharted seas.

Again religion is expressed in man's devotion to those ideals which guide him on the way of life. Those ideals which call men to strive for a higher and fuller life for humanity, guide men, as stars do the mariner, on the way. The religious man accepts the authority of these ideals which changing with his increasing experience ever challenge him to enter upon richer and richer experience.

The authority of such a religion lies not in a Book, Church, or Person but in man's capacity to respond to the truth as he sees it.

Religion is the name for those aspects of life which mark man as man. The religious man is one who

Searches for the truth,
Keeps an open mind,
Aspires to higher attainment,
Holds freedom for himself and for others as the basilar condition of life,
Reverences all life and creates a fellowship with all by obeying the law of good will.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

Jottings

A report from San Francisco tells us of the decoration of an army mule at a military review in his honor at the Presidio. The award was made for "valor under fire." As the animal stood in the reviewing stand munching carrots, the regiment marched by with the infantrymen at salute and the officers with their swords at their brows. This performance strikes us as wholly appropriate to the military mentality. This mule is not the first donkey saluted by an army, nor, we fear, will he be the last.

Canada, we read, "cuts tariff and taxes." And there are still some Americans who cannot understand why Canada does not want to be annexed to the United States!

Attorney-General Reading, of Massachusetts, one of those most ardent in denunciation of Sacco-Vanzetti sympathizers on the plea that the law must take its course, is now up for impeachment for malfeasance in office. This is sad, very sad—but the law must take its course.

If there is any one thing that would seem to be unnecessary, it is a life of Lincoln by Emil Ludwig. What with Napoleon, Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm, it would seem that enough men had been slaughtered to make a biographer's holiday, without adding the great American president to the list.

In Kansas City a recent sensational trial was held in the City Auditorium, instead of in the usual court room, in order to accommodate the crowd. Thus the good work goes on of turning the processes of justice in this country into a vaudeville entertainment for the public!

We wish somebody would explain why the courts are used so frequently and triumphantly to thwart the interests of the people and so seldom to advance those interests. When a strike is on, the courts are invoked to protect the employer, never the employees. When a graft investigation is ordered in New York, the courts block the inquiry. When the United States is robbed of millions of dollars' worth of oil lands and undertakes to punish the thieves, the courts are everywhere in the way. What's the matter?

Will the letter "O," in the ancient symbol "G. O. P," ever again mean anything but "Oil"?

J. H. H.

Supplication

Her precious feet guide everywhere,
Lest some mishap her steps befall;
The temple of her soul, God, care
For that: thy altar's noble hall.
Great work of beauty, craft of thine,
Mysterious, glorious, wondrous art,
Which made her lovely, rare, divine,
And fashioned true her tender heart.

Keep Thou, O God, her fair soul fast
Within the portal of thy might;
And in her path thy jewels cast,
With all the riches of thy light.
Creative Spirit! her endow
With Thine own passion's ardent glow,
Responsive to the joy that Thou,
With deep intention, set in flow.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

Abolishing the Institution of War

"From the standpoint of humanity and civilization, all war is an assault upon the stability of human society and should be suppressed in the common interest. The government of the United States desires to see the institution of war abolished and stands ready to conclude with the French, British, Italian, German and Japanese governments a single multilateral treaty open to subsequent adherence by any and all other governments, binding the parties thereto not to resort to war with one another."

These golden words open a new book of peace for the world. They are taken from the Kellogg proposal and bear date February 27, 1928. Here is a clear, unambiguous and unconditional offer of President Coolidge that our government will join with France in tendering to the civilized nations of this war-ridden planet a treaty abolishing and outlawing the institution of war. Breaking away from qualifying adjectives, reservations, conditions, and ambiguities, the United States has made a world peace offer so simple, so far-reaching, so fundamental, that it merits the applause and gratitude of all mankind. Emerson's faith in his beloved America is here vindicated and the answer to his prophetic question must now come from Europe: "Shall it be war, or shall it be peace?" What the final answer must be is certain. It may take time and patience, it may require one or more conferences characterized by sympathy and good will, but the inevitable final answer of Europe will be "peace."

CONFUSIONS IN THE PUBLIC MIND

Notwithstanding the simplicity of the proposal utterly to renounce the institution of war, several confusions seem to exist both in Europe and in this country. First of all, particularly in Europe, there is confusion arising from the failure to distinguish between an arbitration treaty and a treaty to abolish war. It is perhaps unfortunate that our arbitration treaty with France expired in the middle of the negotiations for an outlawry treaty. The original proposal to outlaw war by a two-power pact was made by M. Briand almost a year ago and had no reference whatever to the arbitration treaty expiring in February, 1928. The two are independent and distinct. This is easily seen in the fact that while the new arbitration treaty between France and the United States was signed on February 6 last, the negotiations for a treaty renouncing war are still proceeding. One is not dependent on the other. In the arbitration treaty the two republics have agreed to submit to arbitration all classes of disputes except those specifically reserved from arbitration. No self-respecting nation can well submit all its disputes, including domestic and internal questions, perhaps involving its national way of life, either to arbitration or to judicial decision. And this applies equally to all nations.

Now contrast an arbitration treaty with a treaty to outlaw war. The one indicates the controversies that will and that will not be arbitrated. The treaty to outlaw war says that whether the controversy is within the scope of the arbitration treaty or not, neither nation will go to war with the other about it. The gist of an outlawry treaty is the unconditional agreement of each nation that even if diplomacy, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial procedure all fail, it will not attempt to "settle" any dispute by force. The charge has been repeatedly made in the European press that the Kellogg proposal would reserve to the United States privileges of war but would deprive the European nations of the same sovereign right. On the contrary, the multilateral pact proposed by our government would bind the United States not to go to war with its signatory or signatories over any dispute or any question. Here the confusion or arbitration with outlawry is made manifest. The foreign press has jumped to the conclusion that because the arbitration treaty reserves from submission certain controversies, we therefore reserve war for those controversies. The Kellogg proposal has no such reservation, but explicitly renounces war as to all controversies, including those excepted from arbitration. In other words, the signatories would, *inter sese,* abolish the institution of war as a method of settling international disputes and as an instrument of national policy. The outlawing of war as an institution needs no reservation.

The Kellogg proposal would permit and perhaps require not a reservation but what might be called a safeguard which would apply equally to every signatory. A reservation in a treaty signifies protection or preference as to one signatory alone; a safeguard would afford protection to all signatories. The suggested safeguard would provide that where a dispute cannot be settled by the ordinary processes of diplomacy or by arbitration or judicial procedure, each nation will leave the matter in *statu quo,* and will not do any act violative of the spirit of the treaty or prejudicial to or in conflict with the right of any signatory. The phraseology of such provision will be the natural by-product of a will to peace. With the multiplying of signatures to the treaty renouncing war this provision, elaborated, would find its way into a modus vivendi or temporary code and thence into the comprehensive code which would complete and supplement the abolition of war.

OUTLAWRY DOES NOT EXCLUDE ABRITRATION

It has also been asserted, both in this country and abroad, that outlawry of war depends for its efficacy upon juridical machinery alone, and in effect discards the process of arbitration as well as the political methods of conference and conciliation. But there is no such suggestion in the Kellogg proposal and there is no such opinion held among the advocates of war outlawry. On the contrary, not only are the "abolitionists" friendly to the processes of arbitration, conciliation, and conference, but they insist that none of these can operate effectively in time of crisis in competition with the war system. To paraphrase Kipling, when "the war Jove awakes, the little tin gods flee." Arbitration cannot live and thrive in the same house with war. Nothing will so advance the efficacy of arbitration as the absolute renunciation of war. Judicial procedure is merely the extension into greater efficacy of the theory of arbitration. Outlawry would clothe the court with greater power, not less.

Of course, conferences, whether political or informal, are an indispensable part of all friendly and conciliatory methods. As early as 1923 John Dewey, one of the foremost champions of outlawry, in a published article, said: "The friends of outlawry do not urge it as a substitute for political means but as the method of

securing that division of labor between legal and political agencies that will alone enable both of them to function effectively." And in the same article, speaking of the charge that the "proposition to outlaw war is opposed" to adjustment of disputes "by conference and by political methods," he says: "The disjunction is thoroughly unwarranted in itself and quite foreign to the efforts of the proposition to outlaw war." Let it be said once and for all that conferences are vital to every process of making and maintaining peace. But the conferences should be held under the reign of peace and not under the reign of war. The conference table must not be decorated with loaded revolvers.

The epoch-making peace proposal of our administration has the strong approval of Senator Borah, chairman of the senate foreign relations committee. His article of February 5 in the New York *Times* challenges France's claim of inhibitions and war-commitments, and appeals to the conscience of the league and to the spirit of Locarno to interpret and if necessary to amend their written instruments to advance the cause of peace. Mr. Kellogg, in his historic reply to France, generously says: "I am reluctant to believe, however, that the provisions of the covenant of the league of nations really stand in the way of the cooperation of the United States and members of the league of nations in a common effort to abolish the institution of war." It was certainly a shock to millions of good people in this country who have supported the league as an instrument of peace when France answered that a treaty unconditionally outlawing war must be rejected because of the war commitments of the covenant. For the business of peace is the primary and fundamental purpose of the league.

OUTLAWRY AND THE LEAGUE

About two years ago articles 13, etc., of the covenant were amended to enlarge the war-enforcement powers of the council. Is it too much to ask that if necessary the league amend its covenant so that the barbarous institution of war may be banished from international relations? But as shown by Senator Borah in his article, such amendment may not be necessary. For whatever war commitments exist, whether in the covenant or in "defensive alliances," could remain in suspense or abeyance under a paramount treaty outlawing war. That is to say, as long as the outlawry treaty is not broken, there would be no occasion for the exercise of these dormant war commitments. But if a signatory uses force or otherwise violates the outlawry treaty, automatically the other signatories would be remitted to their war commitments under the league and under their other alliances. A provision to this effect could be inserted in the treaty itself so as to free the question from doubt. Thus we would have a treaty abolishing the use of war for the settlement of international disputes and as an instrument of national policy, which if respected would obviate the need of any kind of "war commitments." And if there is no faith in the world, and one signatory to the outlawry treaty should wantonly attack another, which is almost inconceivable, the *status quo ante* of war commitments (now so highly prized by France) would be restored. Pertinent and adequate provisions could be agreed upon at an international conference where all phases of war and peace were fully considered, and all serious obstacles removed. In the crisp philosophy of Hamlet "the readiness is all."

"AGGRESSION"

Up to the present time it appears that Europe is only willing to outlaw "aggressive" war. As this seems to be the crux of the difference between the two continents, carrying as it does the burden of "sanctions," a few comments are submitted. The term "aggression" or "aggressor nation" is not defined in the league covenant and in spite of numerous efforts no definition has been found acceptable even to the members of the league of nations. The definition of an aggressor nation, if accepted by the members and impartially administered, would create a serious menace to the league itself. For it is somewhat obvious that if one of the Big Five of the council is declared to be the "aggressor" it would instantly break up the league. For example, could the league possibly survive a decision that Britain or France was the "aggressor"? And the very attempt to give a purely artificial and irrelevant definition to the war-word "aggression" is proof in itself of its futility. As Mr. Ponsonby so tersely put it recently in the House of Commons: "The myth of aggression keeps the war game going."

What the Kellogg proposal really means is to outlaw the institution of war, to cast out war from the fiber of international law so that the god of force shall be dethroned. Here again confusion is created on both sides of the Atlantic by lugging in and misapplying the right of self-defense. There is a vast difference between the inherent right of self-defense by a nation against a sudden or wanton attack, and the subtle differentiation between "defensive war" and "aggressive war." As a matter of fact, the only definition of an "aggressor nation" that has any reality in it is this: "An aggressor nation is the nation you are at war with." Every nation participating in the world war insisted and insists that it was fighting a "defensive" war. Thus we get nowhere and we doubt whether history will get very far with this proposition.

"DEFENSIVE DUELING"

Suppose this same distinction had been urged when the institution of dueling was outlawed. The individual right of self-defense is just as inherent and much more simple and obvious than the same right in a nation. Suppose then it had been urged that only "aggressive dueling" should be outlawed and that "defensive dueling" be left intact. For defensive dueling has the same relation to an individual's right of self-defense that defensive war has to a nation's right of self-defense. Such a suggestion relative to dueling would have been silly, but the analogy is perfectly sound. What we did was to outlaw the institution of dueling, a method theretofore recognized by law for the settlement of disputes of so-called honor. You do not outlaw an institution if you leave half of it remaining. Our nation found it could not remain half slave and half free, and the world will find that it cannot remain half war and half peace. But the institution of dueling was utterly abolished. If two people fight with deadly weapons, it is not now a "duel" except as a metaphor, a figure of speech. The institution is gone. The right of personal self-defense cannot restore it.

So it should be with war. The institution of war must be de-legalized, outlawed, abolished. This legalized "court" of war must be destroyed. The surgical

operation must be thorough, the cancer of war must be removed from the body politic of civilization. After that, and as long as the outlawing of war remains the keystone of international law, violence may indeed break out, but it will not come as the legal institution of war, as a method recognized by international law to "settle" disputes, or as an instrument of national policy. This is not quibbling. This is following the course that civilization has been compelled to pursue for its own preservation when other institutions have in the course of time become inimical to society and altogether intolerable. Thus we did with international piracy, with the international slave trade, with dueling, with feuds and private wars, with domestic slavery, with wager of battle and ordeal of battle, and with polygamy. When civilization has determined to get rid of an institution hitherto lawful, but which has become a nuisance, has it ever succeeded by using force, as we sought to do in a "war to end war"? No institution has ever been gotten rid of by force. And an international institution can be abolished only through the voluntary condemnation and renunciation of it by the sovereign nations in an international treaty culminating in international law. Then we will be rid also of the ghost of defensive war, which is merely a skeleton in the closet of the war system.

It is confidently hoped that the Briand-Kellogg correspondence will eventuate in a general international conference in which the whole subject of renouncing, outlawing and abolishing war can be considered and an honest effort commonly made to meet the Kellogg proposal openly, fully, thoroughly, and to work out such devices and safeguards as the wisdom of the conference decides to be necessary to the life of the nations and therefore to the success of the treaty itself. Europe has obviously far more to gain than America in the abolition of war. But it is too much to expect results in such vital negotiations carried on at a distance of three thousand miles. Differences will dissolve in contact and good will. S. O. LEVINSON.

A Letter from London

The death of Herbert Asquith, Earl of Oxford and Asquith, has called forth the flood of tributes usual to the passing of the "great." In some ways he deserved that title, anyway, he was a great imperialist and a great parliamentarian, too; knew every trick of the trade of befogging the ignorant, ignoring the important and "cloaking his designs in classical and sonorous language." He will go down to history as the Prime Minister who ran England into the War, for it was he and Grey who committed Britain to the foreign policy of France and Russia until "we went to war in a Russian quarrel because we were tied to France in the dark," as Lord Loreburn put it.

His book about that period reaches the high water mark of hypocrisy even amongst attempts to disclaim responsibility for the debauch of 1914. Today the papers are full of tributes to his "honesty" and "his high standards of personal honour" and one is reminded of the comments of Georges Demartial upon the equally high "standard of personal honesty" of Raymond Poincaré. Demartial in "L'Evangile du Quai d'Orsay" quotes Macaulay as writing: "We confess that for our part we cannot understand the common saying 'A good man but a bad king.' We could as easily understand such sayings as 'A good man but a bad father, a good man but a disloyal friend.' In weighing up the character of an individual we cannot examine his conduct and at the same time take no account of the way in which he has filled an important position. And if in the exercise of office we find him egotistical, cruel and deceitful, we shall take the liberty of calling him a bad man, in spite of his temperance at table and of his regularity in church attendance."

The Press is probably the most alarming of all modern problems to those who try to look ahead. When one remembers that vast numbers of people read little or nothing else than the headlines of one paper per day, and that nothing good ever makes a "good" headline, we begin to get an angle on the crime and suicide statistics.

It was Lord Rosebery who said of Northcliffe, when he followed the prodigious success of the Daily Mail by the production of the Daily Mirror, "Mr. Harmsworth, having made a paper for people who cannot think, is now making one for people who cannot read." Northcliffe's brother, Lord Rothermere, has just announced his intention of covering Britain with evening papers run by his Trust. What hope can there be for a people subject to a twice daily dose of dope and lies which deliberately exploits and panders to the lowest instincts of its readers, and which is literally substituting for the capacity to think an incapacity to react to anything but the coarsest emotion?

The Press of Britain is practically in the hands of five multimillionaires whose lack of principle is only equalled by their vulgarity. Lords Beaverbrook and Rothermere control between them papers which find some fifteen million readers. The bulk of the remaining popular press is in the hands of the three Berry brothers, vulgarians all, out for pelf, power and peerages. (Only one of them so far has a peerage but there is an election coming and no doubt Lloyd George's example will be followed again.)

The latest paper to succumb to the Trusts is Lord Burnham's famous "Daily Telegraph," a reactionary paper which is almost as dull as "The Times," and quite as narrow. It has been bought by the Berry Brothers.

Another unexpected change during the last few weeks was the amalgamation of the "Westminster Gazette" with the "Daily News," which deprived the Asquith following in the Liberal Party of any voice in the press.

The saddest part of these present day deals by which newspapers, which used to have a character of their own, are sold over the counter like pieces of cheese, is the uncertainty caused to the staffs. (Both the above changes occurred within 24 hours and entirely without warning. In the case of the "Westminster Gazette" it meant sudden unemployment to many.) The Press Trust has destroyed the loyalty and pride in his editor and his paper which inspired the old school of journalist, and there is little encouragement for the development of such types as H. W. Nevinson, J. G. Hamilton and H. N. Brailsford.

Britain will be in danger so long as the Press is

in the hands of unscrupulous rogues, and there is today only one consistently honest paper in the country—the Manchester Guardian, still under the grand old man of journalism, C. P. Scott.

Years ago Norman Angell pointed out that the Labour Party could never attain and retain influence in the national life until it tackled the problem of the Press in earnest. The one bright spot in the present situation is that its dangers have become so obvious that the Labour and the enormous Co-operative Movements show signs of attempting a counter development.

Security. The recent Franco-American negotiations have had the effect of confronting the international Peace Movement with the question which should have concerned us all from the first—"Can Peace Be Enforced?"

There are arguments in the abstract by the score to show that it cannot, but the recognition that the prevention of war and the making of peace are psychological problems, arrives slowly.

In view of the admissions being made at present by French statesmen, however, there is no need for abstract arguments to prove that security cannot be obtained by bayonets. In a review of the French Press, the Paris correspondent of the Manchester Guardian has recently written that such reading "only confirms the impression that for French security the Treaty of Versailles is not in French eyes enough; that the disarmament of Germany is not enough; that the aid of British and Italian Naval and Military power against German attack on France as guaranteed by the Locarno Agreements, is not enough; that the right of League investigation which replaced Allied military control as a result of the Conference at Geneva in December, 1926, is not enough; that the ring of armed states, military allies of France, and each one of them alone better armed than Germany, is not enough. The French Press comments also make it clear that the Dawes plan does not supersede the Reparation Clauses of the Treaty of Versailles and that the Dawes Plan also is not enough."

And on top of that we had M. Briand in the French Senate on February 2nd "congratulating himself on the results of Locarno, but insisting upon the necessity for control of the demilitarized zone on the Rhine, even after 1935."

Only when the French people, who are as sick of war as any people in Europe, have been enlightened as to the crimes of their leaders in and before 1914, will those same leaders find it impossible to exploit the fear of aggression so deeply engendered in the masses of France. And only then will they attain real security by friendship without threats.

HARRISON BROWN.

"Patriotic" Persecutors

The Boston *Herald,* in an illuminating editorial on "An X-ray on a Searchlight," reveals the work of Fred L. Marvin, one-time editor of the Searchlight department of the New York *Commercial,* and now director of the Key Men of America. The *Herald* quotes the exposé by Senator Walsh, of Montana, of Marvin's whitewashing of Albert B. Fall and Marvin's attempt to get what he called "the lowdown" on Senator Walsh, and it reveals the fact that Marvin's recent Bulletin on "Breeders of Turmoil" is "circulated in plain defiance of law."

In connection with the exposure of this master of espionage and publisher of statements designed to curtail free speech and to injure the reputation of some of the noblest advocates of international cooperation, it is interesting to observe a recent episode in Windsor, Connecticut. Mr. Frederick J. Libby, secretary of the National Council for Prevention of War, gave an address before the Windsor High School. The members of the Abigail Wolcott Ellsworth chapter of the D. A. R., which like other chapters has received much misinformation regarding Mr. Libby and other peace workers, credulously accepted it and sent a protest to the Windsor Chamber of Commerce and to the local Post of the American Legion. The Hartford *Times* reports the Legion "tabled this without comment." The Chamber of Commerce received a copy of a courteous and careful letter which the Superintendent of Schools, Daniel Howard, had sent to the D. A. R. chapter. This was approved by the Chamber of Commerce "unanimously and enthusiastically," since which, the author of the resolution has assured the Superintendent that she will make no more objection.

Superintendent Howard recounted Mr. Libby's unusual preparation for international work from his studies at Oxford, Marburg and Berlin; his travel in Egypt and the Far East, and his relief work during and after war time for the Red Cross and Friends' Service committee in France, Germany and other countries. The National Council for Prevention of War "followed in 1922 the lead of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee in advocating a reduction of personnel in the Navy as a result of the Washington Conference. For this Mr. Libby incurred the animosity of those extreme militarists who look with disfavor on such action. Some of them began a most cruel attack upon Mr. Libby and his friends and they have continued it ever since. They have accused him of being a liar, a communist, and an agent of Soviet Russia and of joining the Quakers in 1918 to secure exemption from military service; but notwithstanding Mr. Libby's complete vindication, certain leaders high in the Councils of the D. A. R. continue to give circulation to some of the most unwarranted charges. They have distributed literature against him and his work and against a host of others engaged in similar work. They have circulated a pamphlet known as the Common Enemy which may fittingly be called the hand book of the New Inquisition." Superintendent Howard quotes the testimony of "a thorough militarist and an active opponent of Mr. Libby on the platform," who says: "Frederick Libby is in every sense a high type Christian gentleman. He is no more an agent of Soviet Russia than I."

Superintendent Howard lauds the constructive work of Mr. Libby, highly approved by Professor Shotwell of Columbia University, which greatly helped to turn the tide a year ago in regard to our policy with Mexico. Mr. Libby's aims are world organization, international reduction of armaments by general agreement and education of a kind to accomplish this. The Superintendent gives a long list of eminent men "who find no spot nor blemish on Mr. Libby's record." It

were well if this remarkable testimonial could be widely circulated among the so-called patriotic societies, as their censure based on misinformation is very widespread and Mr. Libby, like Jane Addams, has been the victim of outrageous and malicious attacks absolutely without foundation. A vice-president of the National Council for Prevention of War was advertised last month to give a lecture on The League of Nations before the Civics Club of Harrisburg, Pa., and was informed that a local chapter of the D. A. R. had tried to prevent the meeting, and although ten members were present, they were warned that they might be dropped on that account.

It is interesting to observe the rising tide of revolt within the D. A. R., some of whom have at last found their voice and will no longer blindly follow their leaders. A protest sent by a member of the Molly Foster Berry chapter speaks of the "recrimination, slander, backbiting exercised by D. A. R. members against the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom" and she protests to the President General especially against the "scathing and unwarranted attack made by Mrs. Sherman, vice-president of the D. A. R., who promised on behalf of it to investigate and report to the Naval Affairs Committee the finances and activities of this league." She wrote: "This report was not to be presented in an open hearing where it might be discussed and answered, but was to be handed in for publication without review or cross-examination." She continues: "Speaking in behalf of many of the D. A. R., I am appalled at the situation. Are we who owe our membership to the devotion of our ancestors to the cause of justice and freedom, who form an organization founded for the express purpose of passing on to others the love of liberty, of honor, of fair play, to degenerate into a mere machine? Are we to subject our neighbors to a form of espionage which our ancestors would have laid down their lives to stamp out? Is it not time that we review our history and rededicate ourselves to the cause of truth and loyalty and simple justice?"

It is interesting to note that because of similar unwarranted attacks made against Superintendent McAndrew of Chicago, one of the great educators of the country, Mayor Thompson now faces a $250,000 libel suit. The forty "patriotic" societies who recently met in Washington to support the proposal for 71 new naval vessels, but now cut down to 16 by the Naval committee since the country has risen in protest, perhaps do not claim that because of their ancestry, they are more patriotic than others, but this designation—"patriotic"—would seem to set them in a class by themselves. Can they show that they have been any more active in supporting the principles for which our forefathers stood, in their practical application to modern problems, than are the nine national organizations which just previously met in Washington at the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War? These were: The General Federation of Women's Clubs, the W. C. T. U., the League of Women Voters, the Council of Jewish Women, the Association of University Women, the Women's Trades Union League, the Y. W. C. A. and the boards of foreign missions. In fact, is there any appreciable number of Americans that do not believe in our country and its Constitution, any that are not as consistent in applying the principles of democracy, good-will and fair play as those who prefer 71 ships to 16 and who seemingly scout Charles E. Hughes when he said: "So far as we can see into the future, the United States is not in the slightest danger of aggression; in no single power and in no possible combination of powers lies any menace to our security."

It is a wholesome and refreshing thing to witness the revolt of a considerable number of D. A. R. members in Massachusetts and elsewhere against the utterances and assumption of many of their leaders.

Nationalism is as necessary as internationalism; neither lessens the importance of the other, but as Chester Rowell, the trenchant California journalist, has just emphasized, as nationalism is understood today, it is a new thing in the world. Since the war it has everywhere appeared in an exaggerated form. Said Mr. Rowell: "This frantic nationalism of our present reaction is the best illustration that it is the recent, rather than the remoter past, which commonly holds us back. We put patriotism in its narrowest and most truculent sense at the top of human virtues, as if it were the oldest of them instead of the newest. We forget how new a thing the world, even the Nation itself, is, so in setting up belligerent national patriotism as the final loyalty, to which all others are subordinate, we are merely clinging to the pathetic delusion that the world began with our grandfathers." Bishop Charles Brent has phrased the same idea thus: "The true citizen today is a citizen of the world and his first loyalty is to mankind. Patriotism comes as a second loyalty to be checked, disciplined and determined by the first and greater loyalty."

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones and the Orient*

A Splendid Dream.

The last time I saw Mr. Jones was in New York City, where I was then living. It was in 1918, while the Great War was still going on. He had come to New York during his annual "March flight" from the cold winds of Chicago, to get a little rest—rest by change of work—after his hard winter campaign at home. He came to deliver several addresses in the city, and to see and consult with friends about some matters of importance. We had two or three long visits, long talks of the old kind. He spoke cheerfully of his physical health; and yet I was a little troubled to find him avoiding physical exertion, especially walking. But he was brimming over not only with reminiscences of the past, but with plans for the future. Two or three times he spoke of his age as limiting his outlook ahead, and yet I never saw him more full of thought about things he still hoped to do and to get others to do.

In one of our talks he went over with much detail the story of the great Chicago Parliament of Religions in 1893,—the inception of the idea, the many and almost insurmountable difficulties and discouragements in the way of the ideas's realization and final triumph,—relating some interesting incidents and facts that I had

*Written for the 50th anniversary celebration of UNITY.

never before known, and that are probably unknown to anybody except to the two or three persons beside himself who were behind the scene in everything.

All this led up to his old Dream to which he had given expression in the closing meeting of the Parliament, and which, in all the twenty-five years since, he had never quite left behind, of another great World Parliament of Religions, to be held somewhere in the Orient, preferably in Benares, the sacred city of India. It had been my Dream, too, which I had never abandoned; and so we talked it over and over, and turned it about, and held it up in all lights; and at our suggestion Mr. John Haynes Holmes arranged for a little group of friends likely to be in sympathy with the idea, to lunch together and discuss it still further.

Was the Dream merely a wild fantasy, an alluring mirage that could never be turned into reality? As we talked, Mr. Jones said again and again:

> I ought to have done it; I ought to have followed up the Dream with action long, long ago; for then I believe it might have been realized. But now, after so much delay, when the Chicago Parliament has faded so far into the background, when conditions in the world have been so greatly changed by the War, and when I and you, and all the others who took part in the first Parliament, if alive at all, are at least not so young as we used to be—now, is it not too late?

I answered, "No." The other friends said, "Why should we think it too late?" And Mr. Jones, with all the old fire of twenty-five years ago blazing in his eyes, declared, "I believe it is not." And the decision reached was, to begin at once quietly working up an interest in the matter, and canvassing among friends as opportunity might permit, for funds, and then, when the war ends, if conditions seem as favorable as we hope, strike at once for another great Congress (one or more) somewhere in the Orient, of representatives of all the important faiths of the world, like that Parliament in Chicago, to see what can be done through religion to draw a little nearer together the peoples of the world, to heal the wounds that the war has made, and to promote human brotherhood.

I repeated to the little group the story of my own experiences in the East just prior to the war in arranging plans for a series of International Religious Congresses similar in spirit to that in Chicago but on a smaller scale, to be held in Japan, China, Ceylon and in India—plans which were broken up by the war. I also told again, at Mr. Jones' request, my experience in Benares, where I had an opportunity, in the Hall of the Carmichael Library, to relate to a great audience of Hindus, Mohammedans, Brahmos, a few British officials and a handful of English and American missionaries, the full story of the Chicago Parliament, with Mr. Jones' prediction of a sequel some time to be held in India's sacred city on the Ganges,—a story and a prediction which were listened to with the deepest interest by that Indian audience and which resulted in assurances of the strongest possible nature from practically the whole assemblage, that Benares, and all India, would heartily welcome such a world Parliament, and would do all in their power to make it a success.

Well, our little luncheon party broke up. Mr. Jones went back to Chicago, reprinted in pamphlet form what he had previously said in a sermon about his Benares Parliament Dream, and what I had said about my experiences in Benares and elsewhere in the Orient; and ended by asking, Shall not the Dream be carried to fulfillment as soon the war is over?

But alas! So far as he was concerned the dream was not to be realized.

> This is the state of man: to-day he puts forth
> The tender leaves of hopes; tomorrow blossoms;
> The third day comes a frost, a killing frost!

The frost came soon to Mr. Jones.

I think it is a great pity, a great loss to the world, that Mr. Jones never made a tour through the Orient. I do not believe that I exaggerate when I express the judgment that he would have received a welcome warmer and more general, from the leaders of all the great religious faiths there, than had ever been extended to any representative of American Christianity. Dr. Barrows, the President of the Chicago Parliament, travelled and lectured in India during 1896 and 1897, and was received with much cordiality; but he had no such message of sympathy and brotherhood for all the peoples and all the religions of the East as Mr. Jones would have borne; and therefore it was impossible for him to touch the real heart of the Orient as I am sure Mr. Jones would have been able to do.

I am by no means without hope that something of the general character of Mr. Jones' daring and splendid Dream, something in the direction of the plans discussed by that little New York luncheon group, may yet be carried to actuality. Yes, and *with Mr. Holmes,* who has become so widely known and so much beloved in India and the Orient, *taking the place of Mr. Jones! Why not?*

J. T. SUNDERLAND.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyright, 1928)

PART IV—CHAPTERS XXVI AND XXVII

The Birth of Satyagraha

Events were so shaping themselves in Johannesburg that this self-purification on my part was, as it were, a preliminary to Satyagraha. I can now see that all the principal events of my life culminating in the vow of *brahmacharya* were secretly preparing me for it.

The principle called Satyagraha came into being before that name was invented. Indeed, when it was born, I myself could not say what it was. In Gujarati also we used the English phrase "passive resistance" to describe it. When in a meeting of Europeans I found that the term "passive resistance" was too narrowly construed, that it was supposed to be a weapon of the weak, that it could be characterized by hatred and that it could finally manifest itself as violence, I had to demur to all these statements and explain the real nature of the Indian movement. It was clear that a new word must be coined by the Indians to denote their struggle.

But I could not for the life of me find out a new name, and therefore offered a nominal prize through *Indian Opinion* to the reader who made the best suggestion on the point. As a result Maganlal Gandhi

coined the word "Sadagraha" (Sat=truth, Agraha= firmness) and won the prize. But in order to make it clearer I changed the word to "Satyagraha," which has since become current in Gujarati as a designation for the struggle.

The history of this struggle is for all practical purposes a history of my life in South Africa and especially of my experiments with truth in that sub-continent. I wrote the major portion of this history in Yeravda jail and finished it after I was released. It was published in *Navajivan* and subsequently issued in book form. Sjt. Valji Govindji Desai has been translating it into English for *Current Thought,* but I am now arranging to have the English translation published in book form at an early date, so that those who will may be able to familiarize themselves with my most important experiments in South Africa. I should recommend a perusal of my history of Satyagraha in South Africa to such Gujarati readers as have not seen it already. I will not repeat what I have put down there, but will in the next few chapters deal only with a few personal incidents of my life in South Africa which have not been covered by that history. And when I have done with these last, I will at once proceed to give the reader some idea of my experiments in India. Therefore, any one who wishes to consider these experiments in their strict chronological order will now do well to keep the history of Satyagraha in South Africa before him.

More Experiments in Dietetics

I was anxious to observe *brahmacharya* in thought, word and deed, and I was equally anxious to devote the maximum of time to the Satyagraha struggle and fit myself for it by cultivating purity. I was therefore led to make further changes and to impose greater restraints upon myself in the matter of food. Again while the motive for the previous changes was largely hygienic, the new experiments were made from a religious standpoint.

Fasting and restriction in diet now played a more important part in my life. Passion in man is generally co-existent with a hankering after the pleasures of the palate. And so it was with me. I have encountered many difficulties in trying to control passion as well as taste, and I cannot claim even now to have brought them under complete subjection. I have considered myself to be a heavy eater. What friends have thought to be my restraint has never appeared to me in that light. If I had failed to develop restraint to the extent that I have, I would have descended lower than beasts and met my doom long ago. However, as I had adequately realized my shortcomings, I made great efforts to get rid of them, and thanks to this endeavour I have all these years pulled on with my body and put in my bit of work with it.

Being conscious of my weakness and unexpectedly coming in contact with congenial company, I began to take an exclusive fruit diet or to fast on the *Ekadashi* day, and also to observe *Janmashtami* and similar holidays. I began with a fruit diet, but from the standpoint of restraint I did not find much to choose between a fruit diet and a diet of food grains. I observed that the same indulgence of taste is possible with the former as with the latter, and even more, when we get accustomed to it. I therefore came to attach greater importance to fasting or having only one meal a day on holidays. Moreover, if there was some occasion for penance or the like, I was glad to utilize it, too, for the purpose of fasting.

I also saw that the body being now drained more effectively, the food yielded greater relish and the appetite grew keener. It dawned upon me that fasting can be made as powerful a weapon of indulgence as of restraint. Many similar later experiences of mine as well as of others, can be adduced as evidence of this startling fact. I wanted to improve and train my body, but as my chief object now was to achieve restraint and a conquest of the palate, I selected now one food and then another, and at the same time restricted the amount. But the relish was after me, as it were. As I gave up one thing and took up another, this latter afforded me a fresher and greater relish than its predecessor!

In making these experiments I had several companions, the chief of whom was Hermann Kallenbach. I have already written about this friend in the History of Satyagraha in South Africa, and will not therefore here go over the same ground. But Mr. Kallenbach was always with me whether in fasting or in dietetic changes. I lived with him at his own place when the Satyagraha struggle was at its height. We discussed our changes in food and derived more pleasure from the new diet than from the old. Talk of this nature sounded quite pleasant in those days, and did not strike me as at all improper. Experience has taught me, however, that it was wrong to have dwelt upon the relish of food. One should eat not in order to please the palate but just to keep the body going. When each organ of sense subserves the body and through the body the soul, its special relish disappears, and then alone does it begin to function in the way nature intended it to do.

Any number of experiments is too small and no sacrifice is too great for attaining this symphony with nature. But unfortunately, the current is now-a-days flowing strongly in the opposite direction. We are not ashamed to sacrifice a multitude of other lives in decorating the perishable body and trying to prolong its existence for a few fleeting moments, with the result that we kill ourselves, both body and soul. In trying to cure one old disease, we give rise to a hundred new ones; in trying to enjoy the pleasures of sense, we lose in the end even our capacity for enjoyment. All this is passing before our very eyes, but there is none so blind as those who will not see.

Having thus set forth their object and the train of ideas which led up to them, I now propose to describe the dietetic experiments at some length.

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai.*)

The Undying

Since Sacco and Vanzetti died
I think I almost understand
How in Jerusalem certain men
Long years ago, said: "Christ was crucified
And after three days rose again.
Yea, we ourselves beheld him walking on the strand!"

KENNETH W. PORTER

Correspondence

The Fiftieth Anniversary
A Tribute From Our Australian Correspondent

Editor of UNITY:

I am reminded that UNITY will, on the first of March, celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of its natal day. I beg, as a reader of UNITY, to congratulate you as Editor, on the privilege so long enjoyed of contributing to the support of the great cause of a wider religious fellowship, world peace and international good will.

May UNITY, its editor, and contributors, be able, in the years to come, to lead the way to that larger, more enlightened faith, hope, and love, by which the barriers of creed, race, class, and nationalism, are broken down, and men, as your American poet Whittier has said, are "fused in one humanity forever!"

What changes have we seen in the last fifty years, and greater things are in store in the next fifty years if we are faithful.

Yours in Goodwill,

CHARLES STRONG.

Melbourne, Australia.

Congratulations

Editor of UNITY:

Please accept my congratulations on your jubilee edition of March 5th. There wasn't a word in it that wasn't worth reading. I began taking UNITY fifteen years ago. I think there was no man in his time that influenced my thinking any more than did Jenkin Lloyd Jones and now no man provokes my thinking any more than does John Haynes Holmes. I revere the memory of Dr. Jones and admire the spotless life and marvelous daring and courage of conviction of John Haynes Holmes. May UNITY live a long time and continue to be as useful in the future as it has been in the past.

Most sincerely,

ELMER WARD COLE.

South Bend, Indiana.

An Echo of the Anniversary

Editor of UNITY:

UNITY has come to my desk for the past five years. It has followed me in my travels. Always it has been a welcome visitor. Always it is the first of all magazines I find myself reading.

UNITY introduced me to Gandhi. It laid before me for the first time the proposal to outlaw war. If it had done nothing else that would have been enough. But it has always been food for my soul; it has strengthened my own convictions, and it has broadened my horizon.

Once while in Italy I placed a copy before an English colonel; he sneered at it. His doing so made me all the more convinced how badly UNITY is needed. I hope it will be possible to greatly increase its circulation. I wish it long life and growth and send my congratulations upon its fiftieth birthday.

With warm greetings,

MARK H. DIX.

New York City.

"Humanity"

Editor of UNITY:

I read UNITY with so much pleasure and benefit; it is issued in such a broad religious spirit.

I often think that UNITY should rather have the title *Humanity.* That seems to me, is what your magazine really strives for. Since UNITY was founded it has broadened into *Humanity.*

But I understand it would be difficult to make a change in the *sacred* name UNITY.

C. G. ARNOLD.

Los Angeles, California.

Unity's Naming and Sub-Title

Editor of UNITY:

The naming of UNITY was a fine example of the principle that when the conditions are ripe for advance, the new discovery or invention generally comes sponsored by more than one claimant to its honors.

The multiple namers of UNITY at its birth goes far to confirm Mr. Jones' fondly reiterated claim that "unity is the most ethical word in the language."

I have written of Mr. Jones' version of the naming: how with Gannett on a missionary trip into the Wisconsin wilds, in which they earnestly discussed a change of name from "Pamphlet Mission," Gannett had written down on the pad "Unity"; which Jones instantly and elatedly endorsed.

On a journey from Chicago to Cleveland, in 1880, where we were going to attend a Western Conference, in Mr. Hosmer's Church (I had just entered Meadville), Mr. Jones related what I have stated above. It was also on this journey that Mr. Jones told of the origin of UNITY's Sub-Title, which he had taken from the Free Religious Vol. "Freedom and Fellowship" (Roberts Bros. 1875) to which he had added the word "Character."

And it will add to the interest of UNITY lovers to tell how the sub-title of the Free Religious Vol. came about. Some time after its publication, Mr. Jones was in Boston, and was told how the Committee in charge of publications were discussing, in presence of the head printer, the quandary of a comprehensive title for so miscellaneous a collection of essays, when the printer suggested "Freedom and Fellowship," which was at once accepted.

Perhaps I should say a word or two about my last meeting with Mr. Jones: It was with him and Dr. Thomas and wife, at Mr. Martin's meetings in Tacoma and Seattle.

It had been sixteen years since I had come to the far west. I had been for a few months in 1887 a member of All Souls Church and assistant of Mr. Kerr in UNITY office. As soon as he recalled me he clasped and called me "dear Gillette."

Is not the Anniversary number a splendid one?

FRED K. GILLETTE.

Los Angeles.

Biographies of Jesus

Editor of UNITY:

I feel for Mr. Neilson in his complaint (UNITY, Dec. 19) that it is so hard to find a book with anything new in it about Jesus. I recommend a reading of Edouard Dujardin's *"Le Dieu Jesus"* (Albert Messcin, Paris, 1927), presenting a brand new and plausible theory of Christian origins.

Less original but to me even more interesting is P. L. Couchoud's *"Le mystere de Jesus"* (Rieder, Paris, 1924). It may not be news to Mr. Neilson, but it was to me, decidedly, that the historicity of Jesus has to support it not one scrap of contemporary evidence. On the contrary, there is negative evidence of the most conclusive sort. I do not refer to the silence of Josephus and Justus, for this may be explained, though very lamely, as patrician disdain for plebian. But when a man's most ardent disciple tells not a single thing about him, then indeed he is historically out of luck. You will search in vain the history of human thought for a case where a disciple in talking of his master fails to recite that master's deeds and quote his words. Now St. Paul was Jesus' greatest disciple and the one contemporary who so much as mentions him. From his voluminous letters, all inspired by Jesus worship, what do we learn of Jesus? Not a single incident of his life, not one of his sayings, in no matter how altered a form, not one of his distinctive ideas, not even the country where he is supposed to have assumed human form. He is crucified, not by Pontius Pilate, but by the "demons of the air" (mistranslated "princes of this world"). Never does Paul speak of Jesus as a real sure-enough man, but always as a god or emanation of God.

On the historicist theory Paul's treatment of Jesus is nothing less than monstrous. How the historicists explain it I don't know, not having read as much of the controversy as I could wish, but I can conceive of but one explanation that explains: Paul came before the Jesus of the evangels. To Paul Jesus was a mere god, quite after the order of the other gods of that day who indulged in the popular outdoor sport of incarnation and sacrifice. The clothing of this god with flesh and blood was the work of the next generation, a work perhaps due mostly as Dujardin suggests, to some great literary genius, of whom the Synoptics are the echo.

F. H. FOOTE.

East Jordan, Michigan.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

MORAL AND RELIGIOUS LEADERSHIP TODAY

[An Accepted Challenge to the Modern Spiritual Vocation]

There is a well-recognized, constructive movement at present manifesting itself among the reverent-minded religious people of the Churches, both clergy and laity, of a forward-looking attitude towards a freer intellectual expression of the religious life. Prophets of courageous and clear-cut utterance are not wanting within the Church itself. How far, however, such isolated voices can advance the cause of a religion vastly more tolerant and inclusive in spirit than now exists depends largely on the method of approach and the prestige suggestion which shall accompany it. In other words, it depends, to use a familiar commercial expression, upon the kind of advertisement it shall prepare and present. Science is having its day now with our cherished traditions and has accomplished much in making certain issues clear. But, as Albert Edward Wiggam points out, it still maintains an attitude of academic aloofness and superiority and hardly deigns to descend to the market-place in closer human touch and kindred sympathy with the bewilderment of the average man. This attitude not only strengthens the fear and fanaticism of the traditionalist forces but stays the march of progressive thought among those liberally inclined by the very palpable consequence that makes scientific dogma merely an exchange for the religious dogma. Leaders of modern thought, therefore, must concern themselves more intimately with the problems of the common life and assert, in the face of crystallized complexities of religious thought, a more understanding approach towards a common vision. It is becoming increasingly evident that, as there is cooperation in science, art, politics, without dogma, so there may be the same cooperation in religion. The heart of the New Testament is manifest in that original impetus which glorified the thing to be done, the glorious outlook to be actualized by human effort. It is not in the accretions of dogmatic assurance that Christianity finds its real expression but rather in the undogmatic idealism inherent in the principle of Love. Dr. William Pepperell Montague, in the New Republic of August 6, 1924, under the significant title of "The Promethean Challenge to Religion," declares that: "The banishment of asceticism and authoritarianism would for the first time in history bring human ethics into active partnership with human science." Which pertinently suggests, as Plato long ago set forth, that with philosophers, once granted a wider recognition of their spiritual vocation, the way for a broader religious leadership may be prepared. It is a challenge to modern philosophers themselves to bring their best to the solution of the religious problem of today.

That is one side of the advertising needed. The other side concerns its economic propagation. There is no doubt that much of the stability of intrenched dogma holds its security from age-old endowments that give tenure of life in position and prestige to its representatives. The oncoming generation of religious-minded young people who would ordinarily provide the prophets of the future are not so ready or so docile in the necessary compromise with their intellectual conscience to accept these lucrative holdings as were their brothers of a past generation. If the fine idealism, moral courage and spiritual insight of these youths are to be preserved for religion, there must be suitable provision made for them as well as protection afforded their older colleagues who must struggle against traditionalism's hold within the Church. Dean Hawkes of Columbia assures us that there is a rapidly developing interest in religion, not only as an intellectual passion but as a personal allegiance among the university students of today.

Here, then, is the religious problem of our day—to free the churches from the intellectual theories regarding man and nature inherited from a past prescientific day and preserve the spiritual vision and the supreme values of Judaism and Christianity and find a way by which the accretion of outworn dogmas may be moulted. But who can throw off these trammels of the past? The theologians are committed to them and it is therefore unfair to look to them for the solution of the problem. It is to the professors of philos-

---

A Japanese Criticism of "Mother India"

Editor of UNITY:

Now that the tide has set in the other way, and the author of "Mother India" is on the defensive, the following tempered and truthful criticism of Miss Mayo's book from a Japanese paper, may be of interest to your readers.

Dr. Tagore's point that protests against this misrepresentative book cannot possibly get the audience that the book and its, unfortunately, many *favorable* American reviews have received, is well taken. Those who praise out of no knowledge are granted space; those who would protest are pretty generally refused it. I would add my bit to the shamefully small American protest against a book, the popularity of which in this country, does us small credit—to say the least, and I would let an oriental phrase the protest.

The *Japan Times,* of Tokyo, writes as follows:

A book by Katherine Mayo on Korea may be expected at any time; in fact, the lady may be even now in our midst preparing her devastating data and dealing heavy blows by means not of sticks but of statistics, for she wields a powerful pen.

But who is Katherine Mayo? the innocent reader may ask. She is the author of "The Isles of Fear" and "Mother India," books full of destructive criticism. She is a Boston woman. Her work on the Philippines was so effective, we are told, that American official opinion was persuaded to adopt her point of view with disastrous consequences to the hopes of early independence cherished by the Filipino intelligentsia.

Apparently Miss Mayo has gone much further in her work on India; she has raised a storm.

The lady spent a few months in that vastly varied and truly wonderful country, so rich in history and the triumphs and wickedness of man, and whatever the truth or falsity of her impressions, her success as a writer of books cannot be disputed, if success is to be judged by the noise created. Our fellow Indians are a vocal people, and they are served by a press that is permitted wide latitude in its criticisms of the powers that be, and do not hesitate to express themselves fully and freely on what appears to be the one dominant subject of their thoughts—freedom from the irksome control to which they are subjected under an alien authority.

A Correction

Editor of UNITY:

In your issue of January 16th under the heading "Jottings" you quote a statement from the *Indian Daily Mail* to the effect that the India office in London purchased five thousand copies of Miss Mayo's book "Mother India" and distributed them among the right people and you say that this casts a bright light upon the character and purpose of Miss Mayo's book. If the statement were true it might possibly do so but it is entirely untrue. The India Office did no such thing as to purchase copies of the book for distribution. What may have led to this unfounded statement was the fact that some unidentified lady purchased a certain number of copies and distributed them to members of the Labor party but this lady was an individual who had no connection in any way with the India Office and very possibly was a friend and compatriot of the author of the book. In any case I hope you will allow me to say that I think it very regrettable that statements of this kind should be published without proper verification. I write this in the interests of international peace. I am sure you will agree with me that it is wrong to poison the relations between England and America which are at present somewhat unfortunately strained. Even if the statement were true it is not always advisable for one country to fling mud at another. Each country has enough sins of its own to answer for but to give untrue statements of the other country is I feel a very serious wrong coming from a paper which calls itself UNITY and sets out to work for "freedom, fellowship, and character in religion."

MARY SHEEPSHANKS.
International Secretary.

Geneva, Switzerland.

[The statement referred to by our correspondent was made on the authority of one of the most trustworthy of our American papers. Miss Sheepshanks seems to know that the statement was in error, and we are glad to print her correction.—Editor.]

ophy in every university in the world today to whom we turn. They are already the expression of those forces by which the Church is readjusting itself to the democratic needs of a scientific age. With their leadership and the advisory consent of modernist ministers and theologians the way may be made straight,—if—there be provided an endowment for prophets of high promise of moral and religious leadership. Similar enterprises already exist for scientific and social advance in such institutions as the National Research Council of the Rockefeller Foundation, The Social Science Research Council and the Guggenheim Foundation. Such an approved and tested method points the way. For it cannot come at present through the Churches. As the Rev. Alva W. Taylor declared before the recent National Church Comity Conference: "We continue to exist as denominations because of traditions, a sense of group loyalty and large vested interests. No denomination holds a single valuable moral truth that is not a common possession. There is not in the things in which we disagree one thing that will make any man a better Christian, indeed, enough to save the world if only we could get together like good Christians to save it."

What is so strongly desired by all reverent, religious people must come to pass. In fact, it has already assumed permanent and persuasive form as an Announcement and Appeal of the Foundation for Moral and Religious Leadership in a prospectus issued by Professor John Dewey and Dr. Stanton Coit. "The object of this Foundation," reads the statement, "is to award salaries and student-fellowships (as the case may require) to men and women of marked ability and approved character who desire to devote themselves to the teaching and advancement of the good life and who hold that the highest sanction to the good life is to be found in its own intrinsic worth and in its natural consequences. Its procedure is not to create new religious organizations but to provide leadership of the highest procurable standard for any association, new or old, which aims to bring its religion into accord with science, so that it may overcome the tyranny of traditionalism on the one side and, on the other, the chaos of disruptive egoism. There is no occasion to set up a new religious denomination, in as much as many congregations in the historic churches are already responding to the modern spirit and will welcome leaders distinguished for intellectual power and for originality of moral and spiritual insight." It is further declared that "The committee will continue to consist predominantly, but never exclusively, of University Teachers of Philosophy. Philosophers are constantly dealing, in a spirit of unbiased research with the fundamental problems of religion and the moral life, and teachers in institutions of learning are in touch with each succeeding generation of educated youth. Teachers of philosophy are thus especially fitted and advantageously placed for discovering suitable candidates for such awards as the Foundation aims to confer."

This appeal is now being presented to those ministers of religion in the historic churches who appreciate the significance of this Foundation and its constructive purpose. As their cooperation is invited it is proposed that from this group an Advisory Council may be added to the Foundation and thus its benefits may be extended to men within the ministry of the churches and prospective students for the ministry.

The members of the Foundation, (the list is not yet completed), consist at present of: G. P. Adams, University of California; Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago; H. B. Alexander, Scripps College, California; C. M. Bakewell, Yale University; H. Wildon Carr, University of Southern California; Carrie Chapman Catt, International Woman Suffrage Alliance; Herbert Croly, "The New Republic"; John Dewey, Columbia University; Arthur O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins University; William McDougall, Duke University; Paul Monroe, Columbia University; William Pepperell Montague, Columbia University; Harry Allen Overstreet, College of the City of New York; Ralph Barton Perry, Harvard University; Anna Garlin Spencer.

LESTER LEAKE RILEY.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove

Tel. Atlantic 1876

MARCH

The expectant feeling of Spring is in the air. It's high time to get ready the new season's apparel—to start the big home cleaning. Therefore we suggest the cleansing of both garments and home furnishings by our process of continuous clarification—the most efficient possible.

Schumann & Co. Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 6281 ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS

3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

PRAYERS

By JENKIN LLOYD JONES

Published by The Beacon Press, Boston, Mass.

Price $1.50

"A choice collection of the lyrical and inspiring prayers that sprang with such spontaneity from the heart and soul of Jenkin Lloyd Jones."—C. W. R.

"Beautiful, simple, dignified, spiritual. I do not know when I have been so impressed."—H. S. N.

"Tender, wonderfully human and wonderfully comforting and uplifting."—J. T. S.

"When life runs deep below the surface, the abiding faith in love and justice and the tender enfolding Fatherhood voiced in these prayers will bring comfort and courage."—O. C. S.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE,
730 Oakwood Boulevard,
Chicago.

I enclose $.....for.....copies of Prayers by Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

NAME .....

STREET .....

CITY..... STATE.....